

## REMARKS

### **Claim Amendments:**

Independent claims **39** and **48** have been amended, without adding any new matter. In particular, language of claim **42** has been added to these independent claims. The dependency of claim **57** has been corrected.

### **Objected/Allowable Claims:**

Claims **40-42**, **49-51** and **53-56** stand objected to as dependent upon a rejected base claim, but allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims **39**, **43**, **48**, **52** and **57-60** were rejected. It was noted that the Office Action was silent with regards to claims **44-47** and **61**. The undersigned requested clarification from the Examiner in a phone message on 1/6/2006. It was indicated by the Examiner, in a reply phone message to undersigned on 1/9/2006, that claims **44-47** and **61** should stand allowable.

**Claim Rejections – 35 USC paragraph 112, second paragraph**

1. Claim **47** is rejected under 35 USC paragraph 112, second paragraph.

In reply, the Applicant has cancelled claim **47**. Accordingly, the rejection of claim **47** is moot.

2. Claim **57** is rejected under 35 USC paragraph 112, second paragraph.

In reply, the Applicant has amended claim **57** and corrected its dependency. Accordingly, the rejection of claim **57** is moot.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 USC paragraph 102(e)**

1. Claims **39**, **43** and **57-59** are rejected under 35 USC paragraph 102(e) as being anticipated by *Iezzi et al.* (US Patent 6,668,190).

In reply, the Applicant has amended independent claims **39** and **48** by adding the language from dependent claim **42**. Claim **42** was objected to as dependent upon a rejected base claim, but allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, independent claims **39** and **48** should be allowable. Claims **43** and **57-59** are dependent of independent claim **39**.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 USC paragraph 103(a)**

1. Claims **48**, **52** and **60** are rejected under 35 USC paragraph 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Iezzi et al.* (US Patent 6,668,190) in view of *Mallapragada et al.* (US Patent 6,676,675).

In reply, the Applicant has amended independent claim **48** by adding the language from dependent claim **42**. Claim **42** was objected to as dependent upon a rejected base claim, but allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, independent claim **48** should be allowable. Claims **52** and **60** are dependent of independent claim **48**.

## CONCLUSION

The Applicant hereby submits a bona fide attempt to address the rejections raised in the Office Action and to place all the claims in the application in a condition of allowance. Accordingly, allowance of the claims now in the application is kindly requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Ron Jacobs, Reg. No. 50,142  
LUMEN Intellectual Property Services  
2345 Yale Street, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Palo Alto, CA 94306-1429  
Phone: (650) 424-0100